

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Date: September 18, 2007

In re Application of: Roberto Longbardi

Filed: September 24, 2003

For: Method and System for Integrating Non-compliant Providers of Dynamic Services into a Resource Management Infrastructure

Serial Number: 10/671,914

Art Unit: 2194

Examiner: Anya, Charles E.

Amendment

Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is a response to a first Office action delivered electronically with a Notification Date of July 28, 2007. This paper is being filed within the three month shortened statutory period for response set forth in the action and adds no claims beyond those covered by the filing fee paid at the time of initial filing. It is believed that no additional fees are due upon filing of this paper. If it is determined that additional fees are due, those fees should be charged against Deposit Account 09-0416 maintained by International Business Machines Corporation, assignee of all right, title and interest in the invention covered by the subject application.

Applicant is aware that the subject application was published as United States Patent Application Publication 2004/0068733 on April 8, 2004.

The specification is being amended as indicated in the **Changes to the Specification** section of this paper to correct minor typographical errors.

In order to expedite the prosecution of this application, the original claims have been cancelled and replaced by a new series of claims. New method claim 12 is intended to have the same scope as original claim 5 rewritten in independent format and including the limitations of its base claim and all intervening claims. New claim 13 is basically of the same scope as original claim 6 but is now dependent on new claim 12. New claim 14 is basically of the same scope as original claim 7 but is now dependent on new claim 13.

Claims 15 – 17 are new computer program product claims that are counterparts of the new method claims 12-14.

Similarly, claims 18-20 are new apparatus claims that are counterparts of new method claims 12-14.

The Office action did not state whether the drawings were considered to be acceptable as filed. As Applicants attorney sees no deficiencies in the drawings, it will be assumed that the drawings are acceptable as filed unless the Office states otherwise in a future Action.